334LAP SUPERPAVE ASPHALT FOR LAO (OFF-SYSTEM)
COMMENTS FROM INTERNAL/INDUSTRY REVIEW

Richard M. Hewitt
(386) 943-5305
Richard.Hewitt@dot.state.fl.us

Comments: (10-14-14) (Internal Review)
Overall appropriate changes to bring LAP Spec more in line with current Standard Spec.
A few minor, grammatical changes (noted below and in the attached Word file) are recommended:
1. 334-1.3 FDOT should be FDOT's since it has an apostrophe in the full wording it should have an apostrophe in the acronym. (Same as the way FDOT's is used in 334-22.1 where it reads FDOT's to indicated possession.)

2. 334-3.2.5 Change the word "inchi" to "inch".

3. 334-5.2 Change "Assure" to "Ensure" and delete "that".

4. 334.5.4 Delete "that"

Response: Changes made. ft

****

Ponch Frank
561-793-9400
Pfrank@rangerconstruction.com

Comments: (10-30-14)
I would suggest changing the language in 334-1.3 MIX TYPES from "one" traffic level to "any" traffic level. Only three traffic levels exist in this spec so I don't see the harm in going from an TL A to a TL C to the LAP, if no additional compensation is required. Changes are shown below in "quotations." A Type SP or FC mix "ANY" traffic level higher than the traffic level specified in the Contract may be substituted, at no additional cost (i.e. Traffic Level "C" may be substituted for Traffic Level A, etc.).

Response:

****

Rafiq Darji
850-553-2242
rafiq.darji@dot.gov

Comments: (11-4-14)
To be consistenct, modify the proposed last sentence to read....If moisture is present on the underside, do not apply thermoplastic stripes and markings.

Response:

****

Jack Knowlton
813-927-4714
jknowlton@acp-fl.com

Comments: (11-5-14)
I understand the mathematical requirement for utilizing two standard deviations as the basis for the reduced testing frequency, but I question whether we want to include a difficult calculation into this process. Please remember that many of the people involved in this process are high school graduates who may never have been exposed to the proper calculation of standard deviation. I recommend a set amount such as 25% over the required strength) Statistically, small sample size calculations of standard deviation (5 to 10 concrete tests would fall in this category)are extremely unreliable as a mathematical tool. Example: I have an incredibly good week at the batch plant and get a standard deviation of 100 psi for a 5,000 psi mix. By your measure, I would only have to exceed 5,200 psi to maintain a reduced testing frequency. I am sure that this was not the intent of your spec change, but it is net effect (and the unintended consequence) This small sample size issue could be alleviated by maintaining a running standard deviation, but then we get into the issue of complex math again. I suggest that this specification be reconsidered as it has many possible unintended consequences.

Response:

****

Jim Warren
591-0558
jwarren@acaf.org

Comments: (11-6-14)
Good morning. I am enclosing some comments on this proposed specification change. I'd be glad to meet with SMO to discuss these changes further if needed.
1. 334- 1.2.1: Refers to "Bike paths" but other sections of the specification refer to "shared use" paths in lieu of Bike paths.

Response:

2. Table 334-1: There are few Traffic Level "A" mixes out there and most contractors will opt to use a "B" mix, but a "B" mix could be a "C" mix. Maybe some discussion could be given to eliminating the "A" mix all together and just use a "B" or "C" mix to simply this table and make the mixes more economical to produce. Share use paths are typically low production due to the constructability factor of building these pavements. This would entail a dedicated silo to store this mix, potentially high waste, and production disruptions. You'd most likely get a higher quality, consistent mix by using B or C mix since it could be used for other purposes as well.

Response:

3. 334- 5.3: Warm mix has an allowance for high temperature variance at start up to pre-heat equipment and should be carried into this specification.

Response:

4. 334- 5.6.6: Thickness tolerance of 5% is too tight on these types of pavements, leaving it at 10% is more realistic and achievable. 5% of 1 inch is less that 1/16" of an inch. Come on man!, let's get to some realistic construction tolerances.

Response:

5. 334- 5.10.1 Texture: There have been a number of issues regarding the absolute language (No, Free of) found in this section. There needs to be some adjustment in the text to account for actual construction conditions and techniques and to account for various interpretations in the field as to what is and isn't the different parameters listed here.

Response:

6. 334- 5.10.3.1.2 RSE Tolerance: We recommend changing the 3/16" to no more than 4/16" to account for constructability of these pavements, especially since DOT is currently enforcing a strict interpretation. These pavements are typically lower speed applications, and vehicles are less affected by pavement smoothness at slower speeds.

Response:

****